

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are in the application.

Claim 10 is amended and claims 26-31 are new.

Claims 1-9 and 22-25 are allowed, and claims 17-18 and 21 were indicated to include allowable subject matter.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences “raised the question of whether the claims are statutory”. A single Board member, in a concurring opinion, raised the issue, and this analysis therefore does not represent the opinion of the Board. For example, the concurring opinion alone could not have been appealed by applicant. The fact that this issue was raised but not adopted by the Board as a whole, would indicate that it was nevertheless “adjudicated” but rejected. Therefore, the new ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is believed to be improper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.114, 1.196.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to define an output or result, which was not required by the Decision of the Board, for the purpose of making the claim more complete, but such change was not required under the Patent laws, nor for patentability.

New claims 26-28 represent claims 17-18 and 21 written in independent form.

Claims 10-12, 14-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Levy. Claims 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Levy in view of Fleming-Dahl (U.S. 5,218,326).


The Examiner states that Levy discloses “an exact synthesis procedure which is derived from a class of asymmetric multi-element coupled transmission line directional elements with any number of elements.” In fact, Levy discloses an analysis in which segment characteristics are not independently selected. As shown in Fig. 2, and described throughout the analysis, a *single* θ is used. See, page 229, first column, between formulas 26-27: “The next step of the synthesis is to find the values of the impedances of the n lines of electrical length θ , terminated by lines of unit impedance (Fig. 2) which gives this value of $Z(t)$.” See also Page 233, bottom of Col. 1 to top of Col. 2, which states “Another difficulty is that it is necessary to maintain very close tolerances on all dimensions, and in particular the electrical lengths of the sections must all be equal. Multiple reflections within the coupler and at its ends, where it is joined to

the input lines, may also be troublesome.” (Emphasis added). Thus, it is clear that Levy does not teach or suggest that the segments have differing segment characteristics, and in fact appears to impose a restriction that they all have a common characteristic.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Levy is distinguished. Fleming-Dahl does not remedy this deficiency.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable.


Respectfully Submitted,



Steven M. Hoffberg
Reg. 33,511

MILDE & HOFFBERG LLP
Suite 460, 10 Bank Street
White Plains, NY 10606
(914) 949-3100
September 28, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Services as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks, Washington, PO Box 1450
~~D.C. 20231~~ on 9/28/04 Alexandria VA 22313

By 
Date 9/28/04